

**ENTOMOLOGISTS, MODERN AND ANCIENT**

BY R. S. SHERMAN.

As the years speed by I begin to realize the great changes that have marked the study and pursuit of entomology during the half century covered by my conscious experience. It occurred to me that it might be of interest to some of the younger knights of the net to listen for a few minutes to the rambling thoughts of one of the old school.

My first collecting was done during the seventies in the vicinity of Belleville, Ontario. The only entomologist of my acquaintance—a distant, awe-inspiring acquaintance—was Professor Bell of Albert College. I saw him twice; once with net in hand in dignified chase of some elusive hexapod; and again when I carried to him a male rhinoceros-beetle. This ferocious creature had broken cover from a jungle of dead leaves, and I can remember the powerful thrust of his horned head and doughty legs as he tried to free himself from my grasp. I took him to the professor, who pronounced him a rare capture and a new record for Canada. From that moment the virus of the collector entered my blood and has not yet worked its way out of my system.

Naturally, on the strength of this capture, I ran largely to coleoptera during the first part of my entomological career. There was good hunting in those days. The beech and maple forests had not yet fallen beneath the all-consuming axe of the farmer. From the opening of the first hepaticas to the waning of the golden-rod, the forest aisles were a-hum with insect life. Nor did the snows that lasted from November to April put an end to our entomological pursuits. The half-rotted logs of beech and maple yielded treasures sufficient to keep our interest alive throughout the winter.

I suppose there is no entomologist who has not succumbed, for a brief period at least, to the manifold charms of Madame Butterfly. And who that has once seen our mountain meadows in all their glory could fail to admire those living, palpitating flowers of the air, flitting from bloom to bloom and making the sunlight vibrant with their beauty? Yes, like the rest of you, I had my fling at the butterflies.

But there came a time when the needle of my inclination refused to oscillate to these local attractions, however alluring, and settled down to the pole star of my destiny—the diptera; and there I think it will remain. A recent writer in the *Canadian Entomologist*, commenting on the reasons which lead one man to work upon dragonflies, another on butterflies, and a third on beetles, states that "he himself was irresistibly drawn towards the smallest and most intrinsically uninteresting of insect forms." That explains nine-tenths of our predilections. Yet I am convinced that the true entomologist is broadminded enough to find something of interest in all of nature's forms. Personally, though I "run to diptera," I

am a lover of all Mother Nature's children, be they birds, beasts, insects, or plants; and though I have been a collector for nearly half a century, my keenest pleasure has always been derived from watching the living creature at work or play. The economic value of an insect, bird, or mammal weighs but little in my regard. And just there is the line of fission between the old and the new entomology. The question of dollars and cents looms large on the mental horizon of the modern man; with the old-timer dollars and cents were a minus quantity.

I realize fully the importance of the economic side of entomology. As a citizen I am most keenly alive to the valuable—nay, I may say the invaluable, work which is being carried on by the gallant band of workers selected by the government to control insect pests. It is a noble, a patriotic work; but to me it makes little appeal. Nor do I think that I am alone in this avoidance of the economic side of entomology. I think I belong to a class (a vanishing class, it may be) who study the insect purely for the inherent interest in the creature itself.

There is a third class of entomologists, off-shoots or by-products of the other two—the simon-pure systematists, who care not an atom, or should I say an electron? for the creature, living or dead, except in so far as it avails them to add another Greek-and-Latin hybrid of a name to the hair-splitting monographs they are compiling. The late S. W. Williston, commenting on this modern mania for multiplying genera and species, says: "By an excessive splitting of genera broader relationships are lost sight of, and the tendency is inevitable to restore those evidences by the invention of new group terms to express them. Possibly it may be necessary some time in the future to have a quantitative chemical analysis of a mosquito before deciding to which genus it may belong.....convenience is an important end of classification, as well as the expression of relationships."

What amateur entomologist can hope to keep abreast of the bibliography that is piling up in his own particular group? And look at the changes in nomenclature that are thrust upon us! No, I am convinced that the old-fashioned entomologist will soon become extinct, like the Dodo and the Great Auk. And it is a pity; for he was a harmless imbecile and afforded rare sport for the small boy and the yokel.

I cannot conclude these rambling remarks without a reference, however brief, to some of our departed members, good men and true, who wielded the net in woodland trails that now are paved highways, and in primeval forest vistas that now form the bedraggled outskirts of a great metropolis.

The Rev. G. W. Taylor was a typical entomologist of the old school, and one whose work in his special field will long endure. So, too, was Tom Wilson, who carried on his work and his interests as an amateur and a collector while faithfully performing his duties in the economic field.

His close companion and collaborator, Arthur H. Bush, was never happier than when displaying the beauties of his wonderful collection to timid tyros among the younger group of entomologists, and in giving them assistance and advice. But to Capt. R. V. Harvey our society is particularly indebted for the impetus which his splendid personality gave to the initial growth of our organization. He had the rare faculty of inspiring and fostering enthusiasm in all who were associated with him. Having travelled with him over three hundred miles of mountain trails, I learned to value him as an ideal "guide, philosopher, and friend."

In conclusion, let me say that in our present society I believe we have men of whom any similar institution in America might well be proud. The least that we can do is to foster that spirit of comraderie and good-fellowship without which the fires of achievement turn cold and crumble into the ashes of disappointment. Give the word of praise and encouragement now, when it may bear fruit, not reserving it as a flourish at the end of an obituary.

---

### LEAF-ROLLERS ATTACKING ORCHARD TREES IN THE OKANAGAN VALLEY

By E. P. VENABLES,

DOMINION ENTOMOLOGICAL BRANCH, VERNON, B. C.

The collection and breeding of larvae causing typical leafroller injury in the dry belt of British Columbia during the past few seasons has revealed the presence of four species of **tortricid** moths, viz.: the fruit-tree leaf-roller, **Cacoecia argyrospila** (Walker), the oblique-banded leaf-roller **Cacoecia rosaceana** (Harris), **Tortrix alleniana** (Fern.), and **Pero-nea maximana** (B. and B.). Prior to the year 1918 injury caused by leaf-roller larvae was as a rule attributed to **Cacoecia rosaceana** (Harr.). It was a matter of uncertainty as to whether the fruit-tree leaf-roller actually occurred in the Okanagan Valley at that time. This latter insect is included in the check list of British Columbia **Lepidoptera** published in 1906, being recorded from the coastal district, and at Kaslo. It is also listed by Dr. Dyar in his "Lepidoptera of the Kootenay District of British Columbia" as having been captured near Field in 1903. It was first actually bred from Okanagan material in 1922, though egg masses supposedly referable to this species were noted by Mr. R. C. Treherne in 1921 on apple trees at Kelowna. **Cacoecia rosaceana** (Harr.) has undoubtedly been present within the province for a number of years, and has been frequently mentioned in the lists of injurious insects of the Okanagan Valley. **Tortrix alleniana** (Fern.) was first detected as an orchard pest by the author in 1922, when larvae were bred from apple foliage at Vernon. The similarity of the life-history of this species to